



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,986	12/03/2003	David I. Suda	D0932-00383	5088

8933 7590 02/24/2006

DUANE MORRIS, LLP
IP DEPARTMENT
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

EXAMINER

GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3749

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,986

Applicant(s)

SUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen Gravini

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7,8,10-16 and 20-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 16, 21, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by over Haddox (US 2,830,648). Haddox is considered to disclose a curing oven tower **40** for heating an uncured or partially cured insulation mat (wherein the “for heating” recitation is considered a statement of intended use) said curing oven tower comprising a plurality of vertical oven zones **39, 31** comprising heat sources (please see column 1 line 66 through column 2 line 23 for the expressed disclosed heat sources), and a conveyor system **26** comprising a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors **58, 60, 37, 27** disposed to move said mat through said plurality of vertical oven zones for curing, said mat being disposed between said counter rotating conveyor; or alternatively:

a curing oven tower **40** for heating an uncured or partially cured fiberglass insulation mat (wherein the “for heating” recitation is considered a statement of intended use), said curing oven tower comprising a heat source (please see column 1 line 66 through column 2 line 23 for the expressed disclosed heat source), and a conveyor system comprising cooperable pairs of counter-rotating conveyors **58, 43, 37, 27** arranged for moving said insulation mat both vertically and horizontally through said curing oven tower in a serpentine path wherein figures 1, 2, 4 show the horizontal and vertical serpentine conveying motion claimed since the disclosed insulation mat is

Art Unit: 3749

moved in two planar directions. Figure 4 of Haddox is considered to show the claimed vertical path overlapping itself. Haddox is also considered to disclose the claimed conveyor perforations at column 2 lines 17-18 wherein foraminous belt is considered perforated to one skilled in the art.

Claims 8, 10-15, 22-29, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brelsford et al. (US 2,467,291). Brelsford is considered to disclose moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower at column 7 line 43 through column 10 line 52, said oven curing tower comprising a plurality of vertical oven zones **112, 113** comprising heat sources, said moving step including the step of moving the insulation mat through the plurality of vertical oven zones **81, 82, 83** for curing; or alternatively;

moving an uncured or partially cured insulation through a curing oven tower both horizontally and vertically in a serpentine path through a curing oven tower comprising a heat source at column 7 line 43 through column 10 line 52, and as shown in figures 1 and 2. Brelsford is also considered to disclose the claimed path vertically overlaps itself, the moving step includes the step of conveying said insulation mat with a plurality of conveyors disposed to move the insulation mat both horizontally and vertically through the oven tower, a plurality of pairs of counter rotating conveyors that cooperate to move the mat through the oven tower, and top to bottom recirculating air in figures 1 and 2. Brelsford is considered to anticipate the claimed perforations at column 9 line 50 through column 10 line 5 because the disclosed partition openings are considered perforations to those skilled in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddox in view of Fleissner (US 3,413,731). Haddox is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed top to bottom recirculating means. Fleissner, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a top to bottom recirculating means at column 3 line 47 through column 4 line 79. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Haddox with the top to bottom recirculating means, considered disclosed in Fleissner, for the purpose of using a fluid to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haddox in view of Patel et al. (US 6,357,504). Haddox is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed nip zone. Patel, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a nip zone at column 12 lines 22-65. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Haddox with the nip zone, considered disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brelsford in view of Patel et al. (US 6,357,504). Brelsford is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed nip zone. Patel, another mat curing system, is considered to disclose a nip zone at column 12 lines 22-65. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Brelsford

Art Unit: 3749

with the nip zone, considered disclosed in Patel, for the purpose of using a zone to facilitate a curing process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

anticipation

Applicant argues that the claimed oven zones and cooperable pairs of counter rotating conveyer are not found in first primary reference Haddox disclosure. In column 2 of that disclosure a "gaseous blast **18** of intense heat produced by a combustion type burner **19**" is considered to expressly anticipate the claimed oven zone[s] because in both cases a high temperature zone of heat, as in an oven, is used for treating a mat. Also Haddox discloses a powered conveyer **58** interacting with roller **27** and conveyor **60** or a belt tensioning roll **43** for the mat **37** as shown in figure 1 and disclosed in column 3 lined 27-30, is considered to expressly anticipate the claimed cooperable pairs of counter rotating conveyer because both conveyors are rotating in opposite counter rotating fashion to cooperate for mat conveyance.

Applicant also argues that the claimed vertical oven zones and mat movement through those zones is not found in second primary reference Brelsford. The curing oven in figure 1 and vertical partition oven zones **112**, **113** shown in figure 5 and disclosed in column 9 line 51 through column 10 line 5, is considered to expressly anticipate the argued vertical oven zones. The disclose mat conveyor movement, also disclosed under that same section of Brelsford, is considered to expressly disclose the

Art Unit: 3749

claimed mat movement. Applicant further argues that the claimed vertical and horizontal mat movement in a serpentine path is not found in Brelsford. It can be seen in figure 6 of that reference that the raised angle portion of conveyor designated near reference character **86**, shows a vertical and horizontal component of mat such that it inherently anticipates the claimed serpentine path because the claimed horizontal and vertical mat motion of that reference would cause a serpentine path as claimed.

The anticipatory rejections are considered proper and maintained.

obviousness

Applicant argues that because the anticipatory rejections are overcome so should the obviousness rejections. The anticipatory rejections are considered proper, therefore, the obviousness rejections are considered proper and maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3749

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG
February 21, 2006

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Stephen Gravini".